PALGO JOURNAL OF EDUCATION RESEARCH (PJER)

http://www.palgojournals.org/PJER/Index.htm

REVIEWERS GUIDE

PART A: ***Editorial Office Only***

SECTION I

Reviewer's Name:	
E-mail :	
Manuscript Number:	
Title:	Investigating Parental Perceptions of School Hygiene Practices and Its Impact on Lower Primary School Pupils' Health and Academic Performance
Date Sent To Reviewer:	
Date Expected From Reviewer:	

PART B: ***Reviewer Only***

SECTION II: Comments (Please give your critical comment for the deficiencies of each section of the manuscript. Comments on formating style of the journal, typographical mistakes and grammatical errors are not encouraged).

Abstract	The abstract demonstrates clear strengths by stating the research problem and methodology, providing specific findings with quantitative details, including practical recommendations, and maintaining a well-structured and concise format, but it could be enhanced by including the sample size and specific statistical measures used, briefly explaining how qualitative and quantitative findings were integrated despite mentioning a "mixed-methods design," and adding one sentence about the theoretical framework or conceptual model that guided the study to provide readers with better context for understanding the research approach.
Introduction:	The introduction demonstrates clear strengths by establishing global and local context for the research

	problem, providing relevant international comparisons from Ethiopia, Pakistan, and China, effectively linking hygiene practices to both health and educational outcomes, and maintaining good progression from global to local issues, but it would benefit from a clearer theoretical framework that goes beyond referencing WASH initiatives to explicitly discuss theories of health behavior change or educational environment theories that inform their approach, thereby strengthening the conceptual foundation of the study.
Methodology:	The methodology demonstrates clear strengths through its appropriate mixed-methods design for the research questions, clear rationale for study location selection, good instrument validation process with Cronbach's alpha of 0.78, and appropriate analytical approaches for both quantitative and qualitative data, but several methodological details require clarification and expansion including the lack of specific information about sample sizes for different participant groups and whether power analysis was conducted, insufficient details about multistage sampling stratification criteria and selection procedures, missing information about data collection timelines and response rates, and no mention of ethical approval or informed consent procedures, which could be enhanced by including a flowchart showing the sampling process and final sample sizes, adding information about inter-rater reliability for observational data, and providing more detail about the qualitative data analysis process including coding process.
Results:	The results section demonstrates clear strengths through its presentation of quantitative findings in well-structured tables, appropriate use of statistical tests including chi-square and regression analysis, good integration of quantitative and qualitative findings, and well-formatted tables that are easy to interpret, but it could be improved by including effect sizes and confidence intervals to strengthen statistical reporting beyond the provided p-values, supporting qualitative themes with more direct quotes from participants to enhance authenticity and depth, and discussing response rates, missing data handling, and assumptions testing for statistical procedures, with suggested enhancements including confidence intervals for regression coefficients, more detailed demographic information about participants, and consideration of adding a figure to visualize the relationship between hygiene practices and outcomes.
Discussion:	The discussion demonstrates clear strengths by systematically addressing each research question, providing good integration with existing literature, presenting clear practical implications, and maintaining balanced presentation

	of findings, but it could be improved by delving deeper into the mechanisms through which hygiene practices influence academic performance, including a comprehensive discussion of study limitations essential for scholarly rigor, and better articulating how findings contribute to existing theories about health-education relationships. The suggested enhancement involves adding a dedicated limitations section discussing potential biases, generalizability constraints, and methodological limitations, which would demonstrate scholarly reflexivity and help readers interpret findings appropriately.

SECTION II (Cont.)

References:	The reference section is okay.
Others:	
General Comment	This manuscript addresses a significant and timely research topic that intersects public health and education policy. The study's focus on parental perceptions of school hygiene practices and their relationship to children's health and academic outcomes is both relevant and necessary for the Nigerian educational context. The authors have undertaken a commendable effort to bridge the gap between hygiene practices and educational outcomes through a mixed-methods approach. The research demonstrates clear practical relevance, particularly given Nigeria's ongoing challenges with WASH infrastructure in schools. The study's emphasis on specific hygiene practices (fingernail checks, toilet cleaning, classroom sweeping, and compound maintenance) provides concrete areas for intervention. However, the manuscript would benefit from more rigorous methodological detail and deeper analytical discussion to strengthen its scholarly contribution.

SECTION III - Please rate the following: ***(1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)***

Originality:	2
Contribution To The Field:	2
Technical Quality:	3
Clarity Of Presentation :	2
Depth Of Research:	3

SECTION IV - Recommandation: (*Kindly Mark With An X*)

Accept (Tick the appropriate box below)

Requires Minor Corrections:	**x**
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit to another publication such as:	
Reject (Please be Specific):	

SECTION V: Additional Comments (Please make suggestions to authors).

Please add any additional comments (Including comments/suggestions regarding online supplementary materials, if any):